

REMARKS

Claims 13-18, 20-30 and 33-46 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that the term “adjustable dimension” is not readily understood by the Examiner. The term “adjustable dimension” has been deleted from the claims. Claim 41 has been cancelled.

The Examiner indicated that 42-46 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 42 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner indicated that claim 38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the features of the base claim and any intervening claims and to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 38 has been rewritten in independent form to include the features of claim 13 and to overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claims 13-18, 20-30 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ritchie. Ritchie does not disclose a vehicle door module including a spacing element that contacts an elongated stiffening element, a support element and an outer panel element. The Examiner is calling the adhesive 70 of Ritchie the spacing element. The adhesive 70 contacts the outer skin member 12 (which the Examiner is calling the outer panel element) and the intermediate shell 16 (which the Applicant believes the Examiner is calling the elongated stiffening member as shown in the Figure of the Office Action as it includes the metal reinforcing plates 50). That is, the adhesive 70 contacts only two elements and not three elements as claimed. The adhesive 70 does not contact any other component, specifically not a support element as claimed. Additionally, the Applicant is unclear as to what component the Examiner is considering the “support element.” The figure in the Office Action only generally labels the structure as the “support element,” and it is unclear to Applicant how the Examiner is interpreting this element. However, as stated above, no third component (and therefore no support element) contacts the adhesive 70, and therefore the claimed invention is not obvious.

Claims 33 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritchie.

Claims 33 and 36-37 depend on patentable independent claim 13 and allowable for the reasons set forth above.

No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/Karin H. Butchko/

Karin H. Butchko
Registration No. 45,864
Attorneys for Applicant
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: December 1, 2008